

## REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 14, 2002 (Paper No. 8). Claims 1, 2, 4 to 12 and 14 to 21 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 11 and 21, the independent claims, are being amended.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

By the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,896,165 (Rao) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,778,053 (Skarbo), and Claims 6 to 10 and 16 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rao in view of Gerszberg.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a communication apparatus capable of receiving communication information from the outside. A discrimination means discriminates presence or absence of reception of the communication information. In a case that the received communication information is judged as an image signal, a control means executes control, to set a recording apparatus, which is capable of recording, so as to cause the recording apparatus to start recording and to record the recording start point at the start of recording. An important feature of the claimed invention is that the communication apparatus and the recording apparatus are connected to each other through a network, and the control means executes a communication protocol of the network and transmits a command to start the recording for the recording apparatus.

The applied art, in particular Rao and Skarbo, is not seen to disclose or to suggest connecting a communication and recording apparatuses through a network, a

communication protocol of the network being executed by a control means, which transmits a command to start the recording for the recording apparatus.

Rao is seen to describe a video answering machine which records both an outgoing video and audio message, either of which may be used to respond to an incoming call, and which accepts either an audio or video response, as selected by the caller. See Abstract, Figure 2, and col. 2, lines 52 to 54. Nothing in Rao, however, is seen to disclose a communication apparatus networked with a recording apparatus such that a control means of the communication apparatus uses the communication protocol of the network to transmit a command to start recording by the recording apparatus.

Skarbo is not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted with respect to Rao. More particularly, Skarbo is seen to describe a data conferencing system, in which a caller may leave a message if the callee does not answer a conference call. Abstract, and col. 2, lines 15 to 23. Nothing in Skarbo, and in particular the cited portions of Skarbo, is seen to disclose or to suggest a communication apparatus networked with a recording apparatus such that a control means of the communication apparatus uses the communication protocol of the network to transmit a command to start recording by the recording apparatus.

A review of the other art applied against the dependent claims, namely Gerszberg, has failed to reveal anything which, in the Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the above-discussed art, as a reference against the independent claims herein. More particularly, Gerszberg is seen to describe a natural language query interface to a directory assistance database. Gerszberg is not seen to disclose or to suggest the above-discussed claimed features.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 11 and 21 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The remaining claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200